



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,143	12/27/2000	Janice Renwick	088305-0130	3291

7590 07/14/2004

William T. Ellis
FOLEY & LARDNER
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER

CHARLES, DEBRA F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3628

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,143

Applicant(s)

RENWICK ET AL.

Examiner

Debra F. Charles

Art Unit

3628



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-13 and the specification are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Page 5-8 in the specification uses computer code unique to the invention that one of ordinary skill would not understand and be able to re-create.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah (U.S. PAT. 6697824 B1), Galich et al. (U.S.PAT. 6535591 B1) and Richards(U.S. 6408303 B1).

Re claims 1 and 13: Bowman-Amuah discloses a method for processing an inbound document received from a trading partner in a business-to-business electronic commerce data processing system(Abstract, col. 2, lines 15-35, col. 27, lines 35-45, col. 32, lines 24-45, Fig. 16, 19, 20), the method comprising the steps of:

storing templates for automatically creating trading partner profiles(col. 43, line 40-col. 44, line 45),

receiving an inbound document from a trading partner(col. 29, line 35-col. 30, line 30).

Re claims 1 and 13: Bowman-Amuah disclose(s) the claimed invention except retrieving a template associated with the inbound document; reading the template to determine what data is to be extracted from the inbound document and extracting said data; and creating a profile record for the trading partner in the profile database and populating said profile record with said extracted data. However, in Abstract, Figs. 1-4, col. 2, lines 10-67, col. 3, lines 55-col. 35 thereof, Galich et al. disclose(s) selecting a semi-customized profile template(call traffic pattern is a profile) and customizing it based on actual historical calls of the client. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah based on the teachings of Galich et al. The motivation to combine these references is to more effectively and efficiently determine the customer profile.

Bowman-Amuah and Galich et al. disclose(s) the claimed invention except determining if a profile for said trading partner is stored in a profile database, and if no such profile is stored, automatically creating a profile. However, in the Abstract, Fig. 2, col. 2, line 60-col. 3, line 67, thereof Richards disclose automatically creating a profile and storing it in a database. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah and Galich et al. based on the teachings of Richards. The motivation to combine these references is to more effectively and efficiently determine the customer profile. Although Richards does not perform the check of determining if the profile exists already, it is old and well-known in the database art to program computers to check for existing data before creating it to avoid creating duplicate data.

5. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al. and Richards as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Newcombe et al.(U.S. PAT. 6324576 B1).

Re claims 2-5: Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al. and Richards disclose(s) the claimed invention except flag, auto creating flags and flag dataset. However, in col. 2, lines 25-35, claims 31 and 40 thereof, Newcombe et al. disclose(s) flags, autocreating them and

flag datasets. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al. and Richards based on the teachings of Newcombe et al. The motivation to combine these references is flags are old and well-known in the database and networking art and using them clearly signals to the computer system under what conditions a certain computer step should occur, making the systems more efficient and more automated.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al. and Richards as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Webber(U.S.PAT. 6418400 B1) and Pasetes, Jr. et al.(U.S.PAT. 5202977 A).

Re claim 6: Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al. and Richards disclose(s) the claimed invention except one interchange template, and each such template is associated with an interworking. However, in col. 1, lines 15-30, col. 2, lines 50-67 thereof, Webber disclose(s) template and interchange. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al. and Richards based on the teachings of Webber. The motivation to combine these references is to improve efficiency and effectiveness of networks.

Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards and Webber disclose(s) the claimed invention except interchange envelope. However, in Fig. 1, col. 13, lines 35-65, col. 109-112, thereof, Pasetes, Jr. et al. disclose interchange envelope. It would be obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards and Webber based on the teachings of Pasetes, Jr. et al. The motivation to combine these references is to improve efficiency and effectiveness of networks.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., and Richards as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wilkinson et al.(U.S.PAT. 5794206 A).

Re claim 7: Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., and Richards disclose(s) the claimed invention except wherein there is at least one functional group template, and each such template is associated with a functional group envelope. However, in Abstract, claim 7, col. 2, lines 25-35, col. 5, lines 35-50, col. 6, lines 5-35, col. 8, lines 15-60, thereof Wilkinson et al. disclose functional group template and envelope. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., and Richards based on the teachings of Wilkinson et al. The motivation to combine these references is to improve efficiency and effectiveness of networks.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., and Richards as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Malone et al. (U.S.PAT. 5794001 A).

Re claim 8: Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., and Richards disclose(s) the claimed invention except there is at least one message template, and each such template is associated with a message envelope. However, in col. 6, lines 45-67, col. 11, lines 55-67, col. 20, lines 1-55, claim 7, thereof Malone et al. disclose message template and message envelope. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., and Richards based on the teachings of Malone et al. The motivation to combine these references is to improve efficiency and effectiveness of networks.

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards, Webber and Pasetes, Jr. et al. as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Larson(U.S.PAT. 6389483 B1).

Re claim 9: Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards, Webber and Pasetes, Jr. et al. disclose(s) the claimed invention except one message template for each of a specific version of an interworking standard and specific message type; a standard with any version; and any version and any message for a specific standard. However, in Abstract, claims 1,2,3,7,9,11,12,14,19, 21 and 23, col. 6, lines 55-col. 7, line 67, col. 8,

lines 10-21, col. 10, lines 30-67, col. 11, lines 1-15, lines 55-67, col. 12, lines 5-30, col. 13, lines 35-60, col. 14, lines 25-45, col. 15, lines 15-60, col. 16, 1-10, col. 17, lines 25-40, col. 18, lines 1-10, col. 19, lines 5-65, col. 20, lines 60-67, col. 21, lines 40-55, col. 22, lines 5-15, lines 40-67, col. 23, lines 1-5, 15-66, col. 24, lines 25-30, col. 25, lines 60-col. 26, line 25 thereof, Larson disclose(s) specific networking and message types and standards along with version. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards, Webber and Pasetes, Jr. et al. based on the teachings of Larson. The motivation to combine these references is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the invention's standardized messaging function.

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., and Richards as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Willis et al.(U.S.PAT. 4745559 A), Feistel (U.S.PAT. 3798359 A) and Wagner et al.(U.S.PAT. 6002395 A).

Re claim 10: Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., and Richards disclose(s) the claimed invention except template is associated with a stored template record. However, in Abstract, col. 2, lines 40-65, col. 3, lines 15-35 thereof, Willis et al. disclose(s) a template associated with a stored record. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., and Richards based on the teachings of Willis et al. The motivation to combine these references is to enhance

the effectiveness and efficiency of data transfer so that it reflects the correct format specified.

Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards and Willis et al. disclose(s) the claimed invention except a key having a substitution label and a value, said substitution label being associated with a value. However, in Abstract, col. 12, lines 33-55 thereof, Feistel disclose(s) key and encryption values along with substitution. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards and Willis et al. based on the teachings of Feistel. The motivation to combine these references is to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of data transfer so that it reflects the correct format specified.

Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards, Willis et al. and Feistel disclose(s) the claimed invention except the step of reading the template to determine data to be extracted comprises assigning the label to a variable name of the inbound document, and said variable name is read from the inbound document. However, in col. 26, lines 5-25, thereof Wagner et al. disclose assigning a constant or variable text string to a label for an object using a mathematical composite function $f(g(x))$, where x represents a text string number and $g(x)$ represents a corresponding text string in a stored file corresponding to that text string

number. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards, Willis et al. and Feistel based on the teachings of Wagner et al. The motivation to combine these references is to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of data transfer so that it reflects the correct format specified.

10. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards, Newcombe et al., Webber, Pasetes, Jr. et al., Wilkinson et al. and Malone et al.

Re claim 11: Bowman-Amuah discloses a method for processing an inbound document received from a trading partner in a business-to-business electronic commerce data processing system(Abstract, col. 2, lines 15-35, col. 27, lines 35-45, col. 32, lines 24-45, Fig. 16, 19, 20), the method comprising the steps of

storing templates for automatically creating trading partner profiles(col. 43, line 40-col. 44, line 45),

receiving an inbound document from a trading partner(col. 29, line 35-col. 30, line 30).

Re claim 11: Bowman-Amuah disclose(s) the claimed invention except retrieving a template associated with the inbound document; reading the template to determine what data is to be extracted from the inbound document and extracting said data; and creating a profile record for the trading partner in the profile database and populating said profile

record with said extracted data. However, in Abstract, Figs. 1-4, col. 2, lines 10-67, col. 3, lines 55-col. 35 thereof, Galich et al. disclose(s) selecting a semi-customized profile template(call traffic pattern is a profile) and customizing it based on actual historical calls of the client. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah based on the teachings of Galich et al. The motivation to combine these references is to more effectively and efficiently determine the customer profile.

Bowman-Amuah and Galich et al. disclose(s) the claimed invention except determining if a profile for said trading partner is stored in a profile database, and if no such profile is stored, automatically creating a profile. However, in the Abstract, Fig. 2, col. 2, line 60-col. 3, line 67, thereof Richards disclose automatically creating a profile and storing it in a database. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah and Galich et al. based on the teachings of Richards. The motivation to combine these references is to more effectively and efficiently determine the customer profile. Although Richards does not perform the check of determining if the profile exists already, it is old and well-known in the database art to program computers to check for existing data before creating it to avoid creating duplicate data.

Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al. and Richards disclose(s) the claimed invention except flag, auto creating flags and flag dataset. However, in col. 2, lines 25-35, claims 31 and 40

thereof, Newcombe et al. disclose(s) flags, autocreating them and flag datasets. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al. and Richards based on the teachings of Newcombe et al. The motivation to combine these references is flags are old and well-known in the database and networking art and using them clearly signals to the computer system under what conditions a certain computer step should occur, making the systems more efficient and more automated.

Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al. and Richards disclose(s) the claimed invention except one interchange template, and each such template is associated with an interworking. However, in col. 1, lines 15-30, col. 2, lines 50-67 thereof, Webber disclose(s) template and interchange. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al. and Richards based on the teachings of Webber. The motivation to combine these references is to improve efficiency and effectiveness of networks.

Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards and Webber disclose(s) the claimed invention except interchange envelope. However, in Fig. 1, col. 13, lines 35-65, col. 109-112, thereof, Pasetes, Jr. et al. disclose interchange envelope. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards

and Webber based on the teachings of Pasetes, Jr. et al. The motivation to combine these references is to improve efficiency and effectiveness of networks.

Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards and Webber disclose(s) the claimed invention except wherein there is at least one functional group template, and each such template is associated with a functional group envelope. However, in Abstract, claim 7, col. 2, lines 25-35, col. 5, lines 35-50, col. 6, lines 5-35, col. 8, lines 15-60, thereof Wilkinson et al. disclose functional group template and envelope. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards and Webber based on the teachings of Wilkinson et al. The motivation to combine these references is to improve efficiency and effectiveness of networks.

Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards, Webber and Wilkinson et al. disclose(s) the claimed invention except there is at least one message template, and each such template is associated with a message envelope. However, in col. 6, lines 45-67, col. 11, lines 55-67, col. 20, lines 1-55, claim 7, thereof, Malone et al. disclose message template and message envelope. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., and Richards based on the teachings of Malone et al. The motivation to combine these references is to improve efficiency and effectiveness of networks.


11. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards, Newcombe et al., Webber, Pasetes, Jr. et al., Wilkinson et al., Malone et al. and Stork et al.(U.S.PAT. 5781914 A).

Re claim 12: Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards, Newcombe et al., Webber, Pasetes, Jr. et al., Wilkinson et al. and Malone et al. disclose(s) the claimed invention except wherein the templates are retrieved from a map component file. However, in the Abstract, col. 12, lines 40-60, thereof, Stork et al. disclose linked information associated with said one of said regions to be retrieved, and wherein the processing logic searches a bit map of the scanned hardcopy document using a template that is stored in the encoded link information and obtained when decoding the encoded link information. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Bowman-Amuah, Galich et al., Richards, Newcombe et al., Webber, Pasetes, Jr. et al., Wilkinson et al. and Malone et al. based on the teachings of Stork et al. The motivation to combine these references is to improve efficiency and effectiveness of networks.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debra F. Charles whose telephone number is (703) 305-4718. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5 Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frantzy Poinvil can be reached on (703) 305-9779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


FRANTZY POINVIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Au 3628

Debra F. Charles

Examiner

Art Unit 3628
